

24. THE CORRECT NAME OF 'MAROTTI' PLANT IN VAN RHEEDE'S HORTUS INDICUS MALABARICUS

'Marotti' plant in van Rheedé's Hortus Indicus Malabaricus (1: 65. pl. 36. 1678) is an endemic species of Peninsular India, commonly known in Indian Floras (Hook. f. et Thomas. in Hook. f. Fl. Brit. Ind. 1: 196. 1872; Dunn in Gamble, Fl. Presid. Madras 1: 52. 1915) as *Hydnocarpus wightiana* Bl. Dennstedt (1818) in his bibliography to Rheedé's Hortus Indicus Malabaricus (1678-1703) identified 'Marotti' as *Munnicksia laurifolia* Dennst. and this is the oldest name for the species. Based on the binomial *Munnicksia laurifolia*, Sleumer (Engl. Bot. Jahrb. 69: 33. 1939) proposed the combination *Hydnocarpus laurifolia* (Dennst.) Sleum. and considered it as the valid name for the species in his revision of the genus *Hydnocarpus* Gaertn. (Flacourtiaceae).

According to Rickett and Staffleu (Taxon 10: 80. 1961), only those species names in Dennstedt's list are valid which are given under already validly published generic names and the new generic names coined there are all 'nomen nuda' because it is not allowed in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1976) to validate a combined new generic and specific binomial by referring it to a previous publication. In this case both the generic name *Munnicksia* Dennst. and the specific epithet 'laurifolia' were first coined by Dennstedt (1818) by referring the binomial to the plate 'Marotti' in Hortus Malabaricus. Hence the binomial *Munnicksia laurifolia* is a 'nomen nudum' at the time of its publication and accordingly Munitz (Taxon 17: 501. 1968) included it in the 'nomen nuda' list of the names in Dennstedt's (1818) Schlüssel zum Hortus Indicus Malabaricus. Thus Sleumer's (loc. cit.) combination *Hydnocarpus laurifolia* based on

the 'nomen nudum' *M. Laurifolia* is also not valid.

Francis Hamilton (Trans. Linn. Soc. London 13: 501. 1822) described the species *Chilmoria pentandra* Ham. based on the plate 'Marotti' in Hortus Malabaricus. This binomial is the oldest validly published name for the plant and based on it, Oken (Allg. Naturgesch. 3(2): 1381. 1841) proposed the combination *H. pentandrus* (Ham.) Oken. According to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1976), *H. pentandrus* is a validly published name and it is the correct one for the 'Marotti' plant in Hortus Malabaricus. However Oken (loc. cit) included 'Pangium' of Rumphius (Herb. Amb. 2: 182. pl. 59. 1741) also as a synonym of *Hydnocarpus pentandrus*, which is not correct as 'Pangium' is a different plant botanically known as *Pangium edule*.

Wight and Arnott (Prodr. 30. 1834) identified Rheedé's plate 'Marotti' as *Hydnocarpus inebrians* Vahl, and Dunn (loc. cit.) treated *H. inebrians* as a synonym of *H. wightiana*. But *H. inebrians* is an endemic species of Sri Lanka and it is a different plant from *H. pentandra* (*H. wightiana* Bl.) which is confined to Peninsular India. Thus Hooker and Thomson (loc. cit.) were correct in treating *H. inebrians* Vahl and *H. wightiana* Bl. as two distinct taxa. The correct nomenclature of Rheedé's 'Marotti' plant is as given below.

Hydnocarpus pentandrus (Ham.) Oken, Allg. Naturgesch. 3(2): 1381. 1841. — *Chilmoria pentandra* Ham. Trans. Linn. Soc. London 13: 501. 1822. — *Hydnocarpus wightiana* Bl. Rumph. 4: 22. 1848, Hook. f. et Thoms. in Hook. f. Fl. Birt. Ind. 1: 196. 1872; Brandis,

Indian Trees 42. fig. 17. 1906; Dunn in Gamble, Fl. Presid. Madras 1(1): 52. 1915. — *H. laurifolia* (Dennst.) Sleum. in Engl. Bot. Jahrb. 69: 33. 1939; Ramamurthy in Fl. Hassan Distr. 164. 1976 — *Munnicksia laurifolia* Dennst. Schluess. Hort. Ind. Malab. 13. 1818. c. f. Hassk. Flora 45: 44. 1862. — *H. inebrians sensu non* Vahl; Wt. et Arn. Prodr. 30. 1834; Wt. Illus. Ind. Bot. t. 16. 1840.

BOTANICAL SURVEY OF INDIA,
CALCUTTA-700 016,
October 31, 1981.

Distribution: Western Peninsular India from South of Maharashtra in evergreen, semi-evergreen and wet deciduous forests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am thankful to the Deputy Director, Central National Herbarium, Botanical Survey of India, Howrah for all facilities.

K. K. N. NAIR¹

¹ Present address: Scientist-D, Kerala Forest Research Institute, Peechi-680 653, Kerala, India.

25. IDENTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF *AGERATUM HOUSTONIANUM* MILLER (COMPOSITAE) IN INDIA

(With three text-figures)

Babu (1977) has recorded *Ageratum houstonianum* Miller, so far known from tropical America, from Dehra Dun, Uttar Pradesh, and has stated that it is naturalised there. He has remarked "This may be a cytotype of *A. conyzoides* L."

Bhandari (1978) recorded the species from Jodhpur, Rajasthan, with citation of a few specimens. He gave the distribution of the species in Tamilnadu, Assam and Karnataka without any reference to specimens. He has also noted that he is doubtful about the identity of the species.

Johnson (1971), in his monograph, remarks "an *Ageratum* species collected in India must be *A. conyzoides*, as this is the only taxon found beyond the limit of the Western hemisphere." It is probably due to this remark of Johnson that the later Indian floristic workers

hesitated to accept *A. houstonianum*, with confidence, as an Indian plant.

After a thorough study of the Indian specimens labelled as *A. conyzoides* in the Calcutta herbarium, we realised that it is in fact a mixed lot containing *A. conyzoides* and *A. houstonianum*.

The specimens of *A. houstonianum* have been sorted out and after critical study with reference to the American specimens in the Central National Herbarium, it has been observed that *A. houstonianum* is a widely distributed and naturalised species in India. It was collected in Assam as early as 1895 and in Punjab as early as 1896. From this it may be presumed that the species was introduced to India in the last part of the nineteenth century and then gradually naturalised itself spreading all over the country. Being con-